DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 237 CS 506 179

AUTHOR Riffe, Daniel
TITLE Exploring the Characteristics of "News Radio" Stations.
PUB DATE Jul 88
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (71st, Portland, OR, July 2-5, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Journalism; Media Research; *News Media; *News Reporting; *Programing (Broadcast); *Radio
IDENTIFIERS *All News Radio; Information Selection; *Media Ownership; News Sources; News Topics; Topic Selection

ABSTRACT

A descriptive mail survey extended two earlier studies done in the 1970s on "all-news" stations (or "news radio") and compared characteristics of stations using all-news with those of stations using extended news or news/information formats. Specifically, the previous studies were updated by exploration of how the following sets of characteristics might differ among news radio stations (i.e., stations with extended, but not 100%, news programming): market, organizational or ownership, operating, and news content. Data, collected from "Broadcasting Yearbook" and by mail questionnaire, resulted in usable information from 146 stations. Results pointed to several tendencies: (1) pure all-news stations tend to be in larger markets which are more hospitable to efforts to program news radio exclusively; (2) increased commitment to news tends to be associated with more ownership support; (3) most stations' market and operating characteristics predate particular formats; (4) the stations most committed to news (typically in larger markets) have larger news staffs and are served by more news sources; and (5) the larger market stations may require larger staffs just to man the "news net" that is necessary to stay in touch with a large area. (Twenty-six notes and three tables are included.) (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295237

RADIO-TELEVISION DIVISION

Exploring the Characteristics of "News Radio" Stations

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Daniel Riffe
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Daniel Riffe
Journalism Department
The University of Alabama

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Submitted for presentation at the annual convention, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Portland, July 1988.

CS506179

Exploring the Characteristics of "News Radio" Stations

Some radio stations' news offerings (e.g., ripping and reading a few minutes on the hour) barely qualify as journalism. Freed by deregulation, some stations' news commitment has weakened even further, with news operations reduced or abandoned.[1]

On the other hand, many news-oriented stations program extended drive-time news or use news with other programming, and still others offer sunrise-to-sunset or even 24-hour "all-news," what one radio executive defined as "an evolving daily newspaper getting out new editions every half hour or 45 minutes."[2]

Of course, all-news is not all news. To Head and Sterling the name "is a misnomer, because there is never enough fresh, relevant news available to fill every single hour of programming." They argue that most all-news stations actually provide little hard news, but repeat or recycle that small segment frequently, and use non-news informational and service features to fill the time.[3]

This descriptive mail survey updates 1970s work on "all-news" stations, by surveying what perhaps might be more aptly labeled "news radio." That is, the study compares characteristics of stations using all-news with those of stations using extended news or news/information formats.

How many news radio stations are there? Estimates vary.

Head and Sterling report that fewer than 10 percent of stations use information formats, and "only a very few of those are strictly all-news."[4] Broadcasting reported fewer than 1 percent of U.S. stations are all-news, with 2 percent extended news.[5] Television/ Radio Age data show 4 percent of top-100 market stations are all-news, with another 12 percent extended news/talk,[6] a format combination made necessary, Head and Sterling argue, by the costs of programming news.[7]

Larger (e.g., top-100) markets may be more hospitable to news radio[8] because

these stations use "revolving door programming," attempting to hold listeners for only a 15- or 20-minute cycle of the station's repeating news segments.[9] In fact, one station boasts, "Give us 22 minutes; we'll give you the world."[10] This programming style (and focus on cumulative audience)[11] demands a huge audience reservoir,[12] so all-news stations "occur only in the largest markets."[13]

What other characteristics describe all-news or extended news stations?

In 1977, all-news personnel identified characteristics necessary for all-news radio success.[14] First, because of the cost of news programming,[15] only stations with corporate, group or local (print or radio sister station) ties had the capital and resources to make a go of all-news (e.g., shared resources ease large-market coverage, and all-news stations could survive lean billings if sustained by a parent organization or local affiliate). Similarly, revenue from national advertising was crucial. Finally, tne penetration or reach afforded by 5,000+ watts and a below-1000 KH frequency was essential with a suburban drive-time news audience.

The study found little consensus on ideal staff size or content "mix" (e.g., percentages of hard or soft news, or of local, state or world news), but there was considerable belief that extensive local coverage was essential.

In 1979, these characteristics or generalizations were reexamined for 23 all-news stations.[16] Nearly half were in markets of over a million. High power and low frequency were associated with large-market, long-time all-news stations. Large-market stations were more often corporate-affiliated, though local media affiliation was not related to market size.

The present descriptive study reexamines several factors identified or suggested in the 1977 and 1979 studies, as well as others. Specifically, the previous studies are extended by exploration of how the following sets of

characteristics may differ among all-news and news radio stations (i.e., stations with extended, but not 100%, news programming):

1. Market Characteristics: market size, and extent of local advertising.

2. Organizational or Ownership Characteristics: group ownership, local affiliation, print crossownership, number of networks or services used, and staff size. Each of these, to some extent, may contribute to a news radio station's coverage capability. The previous studies did not examine crossownership--though Stempel's early data suggest that formal or informal news sharing appears to occur in such situations[17] --or number of news sources used.

3. Operating Characteristics: AM/FM, power and frequency.

4. News Content Characteristics: local vs. nonlocal orientation, hard vs. soft news, and editorializing.

Method

Some data were collected directly from the Yearbook, and others by mail questionnaire, a process made difficult by the inexactness of the "all" in all-news. Broadcasting Yearbook's[18] 1986 listing of 293 all-news stations provided a basic mailing list, even though other Yearbook data suggest most of the stations also program some non-news (sports, talk, etc.), with only 48 programming news exclusively.

Based on inspection of Yearbook data, several stations were dropped before the mailing: though included in the all-news listing, 20 programmed no news or information, six were in U.S. territories, and one had not begun operation.

Of the remaining 266 stations in the mailing, 174 (or 65%) responded, 28 to correct their mis-categorization as news-oriented (i.e., they had changed formats or had never been news stations). Usable data were obtained from 146 stations (55% of the original mailing's 266 stations, or 61% of the "corrected" population of

238). Similar difficulty identifying all-news stations was reported for the 1977 and 1979 studies.[19]

Because of the self-selected nature of the sample, and evidence of inaccuracies in the initial listing, some caution is advised in interpreting the data. For illustrative purposes, oneway analyses of variance were used for comparisons of means, and chi-square for nominal data distributions.

Findings and Discussion

Before examining the relationship of news programming to station characteristics in the three tables below, a descriptive profiling of the sample is offered.

Respondents averaged 10 years news radio experience, and 51% were station or general managers and 28% were news directors (if possible, questionnaires were sent to news directors, but some Yearbook listings did not identify a news director). Sample stations represented 38 states[20] and over a hundred markets,[21] ranging from 19,800 to 8 million people (median = 511,700), with 32% from markets of over a million people.

Forty percent of respondents claimed ratings among "the top three" in their markets, and 17% claimed supremacy. Three-fourths (74%) were commercial. A third were group-owned, 10% were cross-owned with print, and 49% had a local sister (several had radio and television sisters). Most frequent primary commercial network affiliation was CBS (28%). And while a fifth had access to four or more news sources (e.g., national, state, specialty nets or services), 18% had only one, and another 29% had two services. Questionnaire responses indicated that such sources provided an estimated 42% of the average station's weekly news copy.

Most stations (82%) were AM (according to the Yearbook, 49% of U.S. stations are AM). A majority (63%) of the AM's had the "preferred" 5,000+ watts (20% were 50,000 watts), and 41% the preferred below-1,000 KH frequency. Six of ten used

directional antenna, and nearly 60% broadcast 168 hours per week.

The reported modal full-time news staff size was three, with the median five and the mean approximately nine. Questionnaires indicated that an estimated 58% of weekly news was staff-produced.

The stations' news was decidedly local: according to respondents, stations averaged 62% local coverage, 22% state news, and 16% national/world news. On average, 67% was hard or spot, 23% was soft or feature, and 10% was opinion.

Finally, 40% of respondents claimed their stations broadcast no editorials, but two-thirds of editorializers produced editorials locally. Music was identified as the primary non-news programming for a third of the stations and 29% used "talk."

Based on survey responses, "news level" or extent of news programming was operationalized (i.e., weekly news hours divided by total hours on air) as: Level I stations, devoting all weekly on-air hours to news and information; Level II stations, devoting 50%-100% of their time to news; and Level III stations, devoting less than half their airtime to news.[22] Recall that even Level III stations were identified in the Yearbook as news-oriented.

Table One shows how these levels relate to selected station characteristics.

As suggested in the 1979 study, level of news programming was significantly and monotonically related to market size, with 84% of Level I stations in markets of over 250,000 (chi-square = 13.69, 4 d.f., p=.008), and nearly half in markets of more than a million people. The more clearly defined as "news" a station was, the more likely it was to be in the larger markets, where a larger audience "reservoir" means the news radio segment is also large, and profitable.

There was no significant relationship of news level to mean questionnaire-reported percentage of local advertising (and obviously, non-local or national

advertising) for the sample's commercial stations (n=107). The sample mean percentage of local ads (77%) is only slightly higher than the national norm of 75%.[23]

Extent of news programming was associated with two of the three ownership characteristics (data from the Yearbook) presumed to enhance viability of the news format. News level was significantly related to group ownership (chi-square = 13.31, 2 d.f., p=.001), with over half of Level I stations group-owned (a finding suggested by the 1979 study), and over half also having a local affiliate. Given radio groups' preference for profitable--large market--properties, the relationship of news level to market size may be mirrored here.

On the other hand, Level II stations were characterized by local broadcast affiliation (chi-square = 9.93, 2 d.f., p=.007). But only a third of smaller-market Level III stations had a local sister. And while nearly a fifth of Level I stations but fewer than 10% of Level II and III stations were print crossowned, the distribution was not statistically significant.

Though news stations' appetite or need for news copy is legendary,[24] the relationship of news level and reported number of sources of news was not statistically significant. Still, monotonicity was suggested: 61% of Level I stations subscribed to three or more news sources, while 54% of Level II and only 46% of Level III used at least three sources. More sources are needed to fill Level I stations' "all-news all the time" programming, recycling of news segments notwithstanding.

Partially because of this need, news staff size was predictably and significantly related to news level (chi-square =18.75, 4 d.f., p=.009), with 60% of Level I stations reporting that they employed more than the sample mean of nine full-time news staffers, while barely a fourth of Level II and III stations em-

ployed that many.

A chicken-egg question might be raised. More wire copy can be added to fill a newshole, but news staffs obviously don't grow to fill a newshole, though they will grow to cover a market. Some staff size differences are accounted for by the tendency of Level I stations to be in large markets, where there's too much to cover with the two- or three-person operations that suffice in smaller markets.

Among the operating characteristics (from the Yearbook) examined, only AM/FM split is related to news level, with Level III stations significantly more likely to be FM than Levels I and II (none of the Level I stations were FM). Despite some obvious differences (nearly three-fourths of Level I stations were 5,000+ watts and only 60% of Level II and Level III stations had 5,000+ watts), power was not significantly related to news level.

And while more Level I or II stations (45% and 46% respectively) had the preferred below-1000KH frequency than Level III stations (only 32%), frequency was also not significantly related to news level.

In sum, among ownership characteristics only two (group- and local-affiliation), and among operating characteristics none, were significantly related to news level. But for print crossownership, power and operating frequency, there was--if not a significant monotonic relationship across all three news levels--an increasing prevalence of the characteristics among stations programming more news.

To "tap into" this pattern, Table Two borrows a summed index approach used by Shaw and Riffe, who explored the "advantages" that news radio stations could enjoy.[25] For comparability purposes, only AM stations (82% of the sample) could be used.

First, a group-owned station with a local sister had two ownership advantages. If it was also locally cross-owned, it had the maximum three advantages. Overall,

32% enjoyed no ownership advantages, 37% had one, 22% had two, and 10% had three.

Similarly, total operating advantages reflected a station's having or lacking the preferred 5,000+ watts power or below-1000KH frequency. Over a fourth (28%) had neither, 39% had one and 32% had two.

Finally, total advantages summed these ownership and operating advantages: 14% of stations had no advantages, 20% had one, 28% had two, 18% had three, and 20% had four or five.

While Table Two makes clearer the general tendency for more advantages to be concentrated among Level I stations, the distribution remains statistically non-significant. Instead, ownership and operating advantages are clearly and significantly associated with news radio stations' market size.

How might we interpret Table Two results? Some of this study's Level I and II stations do have the advantages described by Shaw and Riffe, but not always. But sample stations in the largest markets--whatever their news radio level--clearly have those advantages more often than smaller market stations.

Table Three data on the sample stations' news were gathered via the mail survey.

The general anticipation of a local emphasis in coverage was supported. All three station types averaged over 60% of their coverage devoted to local news events. There were, however, no significant differences among the three types in comparative percentage of local news. Even stations characteristically devoting the greatest proportion of airtime to news (Level I) did not also claim a higher mean percentage of local news.

(On the other hand, many Level I stations aired more sheer hours of local news than others; 60% of 168 on-air hours represents more than 100 total hours of local news, while 60% of the 84 hours of news programmed by a 24-hour-per-day Level III

station amounts to just 50 total hours of local news.)

Viewed another way, a larger percentage (82%) of Level I stations were so locally oriented that local news exceeded all other news combined. In other words, only 18% of Level I stations claimed to broadcast more non-local news than local, while 23%-25% of Level II and Level III stations were primarily non-local.

Stempel and Riffe et al. have argued that in the process of "news judgment," some generalized views of what makes a "balanced" news mix (e.g., how much local vs. non-local) may preclude other judgments on individual stories (e.g., "We can't run another local item--give me something from the wire").[26] Given the ongoing, continuous nature of news radio news judgment, the standardization of local-non-local mix found here merits further exploration.

Table Three shows that the three levels do differ on their mix of "hard or spot" news, features, and opinion. Among Level III stations (those whose news programming consumes less than half of their weekly on-air hours), hard or spot news was a significantly larger percentage (73%) of total news than among Level II stations (60%). And the proportion of Level III stations (7%) whose feature and opinion pieces exceed hard news was significantly smaller (chi-square = 6.47, 2 d.f., p = 0.04) than comparable proportions among Level I stations (23%) or Level II stations (26%).

Are Level III stations "ripping and reading," eschewing features or steering clear of commentary? The data suggest the latter.

Nearly half of Level III stations reported no editorializing (compared to just over a third of Level I and II stations), and Level III editorializers were less likely to produce their own editorials.

Despite the tendency (in Table One) for Level I stations to use more wire services and to have larger staffs, there was no significant relationship between

news level and percentage of staff-produced news. Again, Level I stations may produce more hours of staff news, but staff-produced news as part of the "mix" doesn't differ among levels.

Conclusions

These data are descriptive, meant to explore how several generalizations about all-news radio apply to other news radio stations. We stop short of suggesting that news radio thrives only if ownership is of form 'X' or 5,000+ watts is used. Indeed, by comparing across level of news programming we have shown that news radio thrives in a variety of settings, forms and configurations.

Instead, we point to tendencies.

First, pure all-news stations tend to be in larger markets. The conclusion? Exactly what was suggested earlier: large markets are more hospitable to efforts to program news radio exclusively. Those markets can provide a profitable audience segment for stations with distinct all-news identity. Less clearly defined news stations (Level II or III) may become more "like" other formats in the market and be unable to corner a distinct audience segment.

Second, increased commitment to news tends to be associated with more ownership support (corporate and/or local affiliation). The tentative conclusions? Groups have the resources to acquire already profitable all-news stations. And groups or sister operations have the resources--and in some crowded markets the need--to risk establishing a unique news identity in order to become a profitable news station.

Ownership patterns among news radio stations remain intriguing.

Operating characteristics, on the other hand, seem less important than ownership characteristics, and certainly less important than anticipated. We may have overestimated the importance of geographic reach for a format that is

primarily local.

But formats do not configure stations, of course. A station president does not decide to program news, and then select an operating frequency or power. Nor, for that matter, do profit-conscious broadcast groups make a commitment to news and then select a top-100 market for the format. For most stations, market and operating characteristics predate particular formats.

What conclusions may we offer about the journalism of news radio stations?

As anticipated, the stations most committed to news (typically in larger markets) have larger news staffs and are served by more news sources. Those larger staffs account for the greater number of hours of local news a Level I station needs. Still, local and staff-produced news did not account for a disproportionate share of the total news mix for those Level I Stations. News level, staff size, market size, and number of news sources notwithstanding, roughly 60% of news was local, and 58% staff-produced.

This study, however, may have focused too much on "mix" (local vs. non-local, staff-produced vs. not staff-produced). Perhaps other differences related to news level and staff size that do not show in the mix also merit discussion.

Recall that Level I and II news stations also tend to provide more hours, and a greater percentage, of feature and opinion than small-staff, Level III "rip and readers." Depth and enterprise consume resources.

Further, qualitative measures not assessed here may be important: larger staffs make possible improved, multiple-staff coverage of breaking stories; greater use of actualities; and greater choice for the news editor of what to air, etc.

And finally, the larger market stations may require larger staffs just to man the "news net" that is necessary to stay in touch with a large area. Better "coverage" may mean the physical capability to cover the market's many news cen-

ters, and not just volume of on-air "coverage."

This report has provided a profile of news radio stations, and has examined variation within that format category. In addition to giving the facts behind the format, it may provide a basis for more explicit testing of relationships among factors associated with radio journalism.

Notes

1. Research shows nearly 2,000 full-time news positions were eliminated last year, while major market news staffs shrank from a median size of 2.7 in 1985 to 1.4 last year. See John Motavalli, "Radio Daze: Tuning Out the News," Columbia Journalism Review, November-December 1987, pp 4-6.

2. Group W's Gordon Davis, quoted in, "Dry Run Precedes KFWB's Switch to All News," Broadcasting, Mar. 11, 1968, p. 66.

3. Sydney W. Head and Christopher H. Sterling, Broadcasting in America 5th Edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), p. 365.

4. Ibid., pp. 364-365.

5. See Broadcasting, July 27, 1987, p. 70.

6. These figures are fairly stable from year to year. See: Television/Radio Age, Sept. 6, 1982, p. A-4; Sept. 30, 1985, p. A-2; Mar. 17, 1986, p. A-3; Sept. 15, 1986, p. A-2; Mar. 16, 1987, p. 58.

7. Head and Sterling, op. cit., p. 365.

8. At one time, in fact, Los Angeles supported three all-news stations (KFWB, XTRA and KABC-FM). See: "Westinghouse Switches to All News," Broadcasting, Jan. 15, 1968, pp. 44, 46. Large-market competition was not always welcome, however. In 1969 a Washington, D.C., all-newser sued to prevent a second all-news entry into the market, charging the newcomer's parent, the Washington Post Co., was trying to monopolize news in D.C. See: "Can Anyone Patent All-News?" Broadcasting, Mar. 3, 1969, pp. 40-41.

9. Head and Sterling, op. cit., p. 365.

10. This was the slogan of Los Angeles' KFWB.

11. "Cume," or cumulative audience, describes the unduplicated audience--the many who may tune in, then out--during a given part of the broadcast day. See Ed Routt,

James M. McGrath and Fredric A. Weiss, The Radio Format Conundrum (New York: Hastings House, 1978), p. 297.

Head relates an example: "KYW-Philadelphia, an all-news radio station, usually ranks below the leading five stations in average quarter-hour audience but also usually ranks first or second in cumulative audience. This is because of the high turnover in audience members inherent in the revolving door format." Sydney W. Head, Broadcasting in America: A Survey of Television and Radio 3rd Edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976) p. 231.

12. And, some would argue, this programming style demands that audiences learn "how to use" cyclic news radio.

13. Head and Sterling, op. cit., p. 365.

14. Eugene F. Shaw and Daniel Riffe, "NIS and Radio's All-news Predicament," Journalism Monographs, 69 (August 1980).

15. Ibid., p. 29-30. One 1975 estimate suggested that all-news cost 60 percent more than other formats, and 600 times more than automated formats. See: "The All-News Way of Radio Journalism," Broadcasting, Jan. 6, 1975, pp. 36,42.

16. Ibid., pp. 30-33.

17. Although his focus was on comparing a "complete monopoly"--where one company owned the only radio station, tv station and newspaper in the market--to other markets, Stempel found that in the monopoly (and, of course, crossownership) situation, only one in ten (11%) of the radio news stories were exclusives (not covered by the affiliated tv and newspaper). In non-crossownership markets, comparable percentages were 44% and 30%. Stempel interpreted this as indicating that, in non-competitive markets there was less reportorial enterprise. But, given the "rip and read" style of many radio news operations, Stempel's finding may indicate that crossowned stations, via formal or informal arrangements, use the paper's

resources. See Guido H. Stempel III, "Effect on Performance of a Cross-media Monopoly," Journalism Monographs, 29 (June 1973), pp. 24-25.

18. Broadcasting Yearbook 1986 (Washington, D.C.: Broadcasting Publications Inc., 1985).

19. Shaw and Riffe, op. cit., p. 35, especially note 33, and p. 38, especially note 63.

20. Four states accounted for nearly a third of the sample: California, with 14 stations represented; New York, with 13; Texas, with 11; and Florida, with 10.

21. As in Broadcasting Yearbook (see fn. 18 supra), market size is the population of the station's county, or of its "metropolitan market," if it includes more than one county, based on Census data and Standard Rate and Data Service figures.

22. The station's self-reported total of weekly hours of news was divided by its number of on-air hours for the percentages used in assigning to "news level." Shaw and Riffe, op. cit., had designated as "all-news" stations that devoted at least "50% of their weekly broadcast time to news and information."

23. Broadcasting Yearbook, op. cit.

24. KCBS' former manager described the process as "feeding a huge machine that's never satisfied." See, "Radio Copes With the Needs of a News-Hungry Public," Broadcasting, Sept. 27, 1976, p. 74. One former all-news staffer wrote: "Our consumption of hard news was copious. To feed this monster we had almost every service of almost every wire service in existence." Mike Wolverton, And Now....the News (Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1977), p. 48.

25. Shaw and Riffe, op. cit.

26. See Guido H. Stempel III, "Gatekeeping: The Mix of Topics and the Selection of Stories," Journalism Quarterly 62:791-796, 815 (Winter 1985), and Daniel Riffe, B. Ellis, M. Rogers, R. Van Ommeren and K. Woodman, "Gatekeeping and the Network News

Mix," Journalism Quarterly 63:315-321 (Summer 1986).

TABLE ONE

Ownership, Operating, and Other Characteristics of News Radio Stations, by Proportion of Broadcast Hours Devoted to News

Proportion of Weekly Hours Devoted to News:	100% Level I	50-100% Level II	<50% Level III
Market Population			
Percentage of Stations in Markets of One Million or More	47	37	17
250,000 to One Million	37	28	38
Under 250,000	16	35	45
TOTAL	100	100	100
Chi-square = 13.69, with 4 d.f., p=.008.			
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Commercial Stations' Local vs. National Ads			
Mean Percentage Ads that are Local	75[a]	78	77
(n=)	(38)	(34)	(35)
Ownership			
Percentage of Stations Group-owned	53	33	17
Percentage Not Group-owned	47	67	83
TOTAL	100	100	100
Chi-square = 13.31, with 2 d.f., p=.001.			
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Percentage of Stations Crossowned	19	9	7
Percentage Not Crossowned	81	91	93
TOTAL	100	100	100
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Percentage of Stations with Local Sister Station	53	65	35
Percentage with No Local Sister	47	35	65
TOTAL	100	100	100
Chi-square = 9.93, with 2 d.f., p=.007.			
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Number of News Sources (Network or News Service Links)			
Percentage of Stations with 0-1 Sources	21	15	24
Percentage of Stations with 2 Sources	18	30	30
Percentage of Stations with 3 Sources	24	37	30
Percentage of Stations with 4+ Sources	37	17	16
TOTAL	100	100	100
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)

(Continued)

TABLE ONE (Continued)

Proportion of Weekly Hours Devoted to News:	100% Level I	50-100% Level II	<50% Level III
Number of Full-time News Personnel			
Stations with 0-3 News Staff	21	33	47
Stations with 4-8 News Staff	18	39	33
Stations with 9+ News Staff	61	28	21
TOTAL	100	100	100
Chi-square = 18.75, with 4 d.f., p=.0009.			
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Operating Characteristics			
Percentage of AM Stations	100	94	64
Percentage of FM Stations	0	6	36
TOTAL	100	100	100
Chi-square = 26.65, with 2 d.f., p=.00001.			
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Percentage of AM Stations with 5,000+ Watts Power	74	58	59
Percentage Under 5,000 Watts	26	42	41
TOTAL	100	100	100
(n=)	(38)	(43)	(37)
Percentage of AM Stations with Below-1000KH Frequency	45	46	32
Percentage Above 1000KH Frequency	55	54	68
TOTAL	100	100	100
(n=)	(38)	(43)	(37)

[a] For the sample's 107 commercial stations, oneway analysis of variance of percentage of local advertising by News Level was used to test for significant differences between Levels. None were significant.

TABLE TWO

Ownership and Operating "Advantages" of AM News Radio Stations, by Proportion of Weekly Broadcast Hours Devoted to News, and by Market Size

	Proportion of Weekly Hours Devoted to News			Market Population		
	100%	50-100%	<50%	Over a Million	250,000-1,000,000	Under 250,000
Level	I	II	III			
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Ownership "Advantages" (range 0-3)						
Stations with:						
None	32	26	40	15	33	49
Mode (1)	29	39	38	37	36	38
Two or Three	39	35	22	49	31	13
TOTAL	100	100	100	101	100	100
				Chi-square = 14.84, 4 d.f., p=.005.		
(n=)	(38)	(43)	(37)	(41)	(42)	(37)
Operating "Advantages" (range 0-2)						
Stations with:						
None	18	30	35	2	36	49
Mode (1)	45	35	38	51	26	41
Two	37	35	27	46	38	11
TOTAL	100	100	100	99	100	101
				Chi-square = 27.42, 4 d.f., p=.0001.		
(n=)	(38)	(43)	(37)	(41)	(42)	(37)
Total "Advantages" (range 0-5)						
Stations with:						
One or None	26	26	51	5	38	62
Mode (2)	29	37	16	34	24	27
Three, Four or Five	45	37	32	61	38	11
TOTAL	100	100	99	100	100	100
				Chi-square = 32.84, 4 d.f., p=.00001		
(n=)	(38)	(43)	(37)	(41)	(42)	(37)

Columns may not total 100% due to rounding.

TABLE THREE

News Content Characteristics of News Radio Stations, by Proportion of Weekly Broadcast Hours Devoted to News

Proportion of Weekly Hours Devoted to News:	100% Level I	50-100% Level II	<50% Level III
News Orientation			
Mean Percentage Local News	61[a]	60	64
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Percentage of Stations Whose Local News Hours Exceed State, National, International Combined	82	75	77
Percentage Whose Local News Does Not Exceed Others	18	25	23
TOTAL	100	100	100
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Type of News			
Mean Percentage Hard News	66	60[b]	73[b]
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Percentage of Stations Whose Hard News Hours Exceed Soft and Opinion Combined	77	74	93
Percentage Whose Hard News Does Not Exceed Others	23	26	7
TOTAL	100	100	100
Chi-square = 6.47, with 2 d.f., p=.04.			
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Source of News			
Mean Percentage Staff-produced News	57	53	62
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Weekly Editorials			
Percentage of Stations Airing None	37	37	48
Percentage of Stations Airing 1-5	42	30	31
Percentage of Stations Airing 6+	21	33	21
TOTAL	100	100	100
(n=)	(38)	(46)	(58)
Source of Editorials			
Percentage of Stations Using Local Editorials	78	68	58
Percentage Using Non-local Editorials	22	32	42
TOTAL	100	100	100
(n=)	(23)	(28)	(26)

[a] Oneway analyses of variance by News Level were used to test for significant differences between Levels.

[b] Means sharing common superscript are significantly different, by oneway analysis of variance with least significant differences post hoc test (p = 0.05).